REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the Office Action dated September 12, 2007, in which the Examiner: 1) rejected claims 1, 2, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Elberse (U.S. Pat. No. 7,225,232, hereinafter "Elberse") in view of Davis et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0158610, hereinafter "Davis"); 2) rejected claims 3 and 12 as allegedly obvious over Elberse in view of Davis and further in view of Checkoway et al. (U.S. Pub. No 2002/0133554, hereinafter "Checkoway"); 3) rejected claims 4 and 13 as allegedly obvious over Elberse in view of Davis and further in view of Klassen et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0138124, hereinafter "Klassen"); 4) rejected claim 5 as allegedly obvious over Elberse in view of Davis and further in view of Cason et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,681,229, hereinafter "Cason"); 5) rejected claims 6 and 14 as allegedly obvious over Elberse in view of Davis and further in view of Vacanti et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,987,987, hereinafter "Vacanti"); 6) rejected claims 7 and 15 as allegedly obvious over Elberse in view of Davis and further in view of Low et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0055973, hereinafter "Low"); 7) rejected claims 8 and 16 as allegedly obvious over Elberse in view of Davis and further in view Quinlan et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,397,253, hereinafter "Quinlan"); 8) rejected claims 9 and 17 as allegedly obvious over Elberse in view of Davis and further in view of Dalal et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0014488, hereinafter "Dalal"); 9) rejected claims 18, 21, 22, 24 and 25 as allegedly obvious over Elberse in view of Quinlan and further in view of Low; 10) rejected claims 19 and 26 as allegedly obvious over Elberse in view of Quinlan and further in view of Low and Checkoway; and 11) rejected claims 20, 23 and 27 as allegedly obvious over Elberse in view of Quinlan and further in view of Low and Klassen.

With this Response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 18, 21 and 24 and canceled claims 4, 13, 23 and 27. Based on the amendments and arguments herein, Applicants kindly submit that this case is in condition for allowance.

As amended, claim 1 requires "wherein the HTTP gateway selects said instant messaging communication subsystem from among a plurality of instant

messaging communication subsystems using a configuration file of the HTTP gateway stored on the system." The Examiner admits on pp. 8-9 of the Office Action that the hypothetical combination of Elberse and Davis fails to teach this combination. Thus, the Examiner turns to Klassen and asserts that paragraph [0006] of Klassen discloses this limitation. Applicants respectfully disagree. Paragraph [0006] of Klassen teaches a mobile communication device that has a graphical user interface (GUI). The GUI displays multiple icons. Each of the icons represents a different instant messaging community. The device also comprises a plurality of configuration data files. Each instant messaging community icon is associated with a different configuration data file. When a user selects one of the icons on the GUI, an application on the device is configured using the configuration data file associated with that icon. In this way, the device is ready to trade instant messages with that particular instant messaging community.

In contrast to Klassen, claim 1 requires that an instant messaging subsystem is selected based on a configuration file. Stated otherwise, while Klassen teaches the selection of a configuration file based on an instant messaging community, claim 1 requires the selection of an instant messaging subsystem based on a configuration file. None of the art of record appears to satisfy the deficiencies of Elberse, Davis and Klassen. For at least this reason, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-3 and 5-9 are patentable over all hypothetical combinations of the art of record.

Independent claim 10 requires "wherein transmitting commands from the plurality of instant messaging user interfaces to the HTTP gateway comprises accessing a configuration file to determine with which of a plurality of instant messaging communication subsystems the gateway establishes said communication link." As explained above, no hypothetical combination of the art of record appears to teach or suggest this limitation. Thus, independent claim 10 and dependent claims 11-12 and 14-17 are patentable over all hypothetical combinations of the art of record.

Independent claim 18 requires "wherein the HTTP gateway selects said instant messaging communication subsystem from among a plurality of instant

messaging communication subsystems using a configuration file of the HTTP gateway stored on the system." As explained above, no hypothetical combination of the art of record appears to teach or suggest this limitation. Thus, independent claim 18 and dependent claims 19-20 are patentable over all hypothetical combinations of the art of record.

Independent claim 21 requires "a configuration file, wherein the CPU accesses data in the configuration file to determine with which of a plurality of instant messaging subsystems the gateway establishes a communication link." As explained above, no hypothetical combination of the art of record appears to teach or suggest this limitation.

In addition, claim 21 requires "wherein the configuration file is usable to determine to which of a plurality of HTTP servers the gateway sends said HTTP requests." No hypothetical combination of the prior art of record teaches this limitation. On pp. 23-24 of this Office Action, the Examiner asserts that paragraph [0006] of Klassen discloses this limitation. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is mistaken. This portion of Klassen merely discloses a configuration file stored on the communication device. The configuration file is used to communicate with an instant messaging community selected by the user of the device. In contrast, claim 21 requires not only that the configuration file is usable to determine to which of a plurality of HTTP servers the gateway sends the HTTP requests, but also that the HTTP requests are generated from commands received from instant messaging user interfaces. Based on the foregoing reasons, independent claim 21 and dependent claim 22 are patentable over all hypothetical combinations of the art of record.

Independent claim 24 requires "wherein receiving commands from or transmitting HTTP responses to the plurality of instant messaging user interfaces comprises accessing a configuration file to determine with which of a plurality of instant messaging communication subsystems to establish a communication link." As explained above, no hypothetical combination of the art of record appears to teach or suggest this limitation. Thus, independent claim 24 and

dependent claims 25-26 are patentable over all hypothetical combinations of the art of record.

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

_____/Nick P. Patel/_____
Nick P. Patel
PTO Reg. No. 57,365
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400